

**LAMAR UNIVERSITY**

Week 5: Reflection

(ELCC 1.1 k-i, ii; 1.3 k-i, ii, iii; 1.4 k-li, ii, iii, iv; 2.1 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 3.4 k-i)

Part 1: Site-Based Decision-Making

At the campus level, site-based decision making (SBDM) is a collaborative effort among professional staff, parents, and community members to improve student achievement by addressing the outcomes of all students and determining goals and strategies to ensure improvement. Under state law, the Site-Based Decision-Making Committee establishes and reviews campus educational plans, goals, performance objectives, and major classroom instructional programs.

Prior to completing this assignment, you will conduct two interviews—one with a member of the Site-Based Decision-Making Committee at your selected campus and the other with the campus principal. Your interview questions should address:

- The committee's makeup
- The use of formal agendas
- Topics typically discussed
- Level of perceived teamwork (group dynamics)
- Specific decision-making strategies
- Conflict-resolution techniques

Part 2: Next Steps

As we stressed in this course, campus improvement is an ongoing, continuous process. When a campus receives its summative data reports, then the improvement cycle should begin again immediately.

In your second reflection, you will reflect on the action plan you developed earlier. Use the following scenario to think about your action plan and how you can move that plan to another level.

“Move forward in time to the end of the school year. Imagine that you and your staff implemented the action plan, which resulted in increased student performance on the latest Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports. Your campus has moved a step closer to becoming Exemplary, and you want to maintain the momentum. What will you do now?”

Directions

1. Record your reflection in the form of two 150-word essays.
2. Use the guiding questions in each section to stimulate your thinking and guide your writing.
3. Write reflectively instead of in a question-and-answer style, and follow the guidelines for writing listed in each section.

Rubric

Use this rubric to guide your work.

(ELCC 1.1 k-i, ii; 1.3 k-i, ii, iii; 1.4 k-li, ii, iii, iv; 2.1 k-i, s-i, ii, iii, iv; 3.4 k-i)

Tasks	Accomplished	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Unacceptable
Reflection	Completes both reflections assignment using a minimum of 150 words in each reflection. (10 points)	Completes both reflections assignment using fewer than 150 words in each reflection (8 points)	Completes one reflections assignment using a minimum of 150 words. (7 points)	Did not submit reflection assignment. (0 points)
Responses and Mechanics	Few errors in grammar, spelling or punctuation. (5 points)			Multiple errors in grammar, spelling or punctuation. Responses lack clarity and depth. (0 points)

Reflection One: Site-Based Decision-Making

Remember, this is a journal entry. However, as with any scholarly writing, you should use:

- citations from the research when applicable.
- professional writing protocols.
- professional language.

• What important information did you obtain about site-based decision making from your interviews with the SBDM member? The campus principal?

• What information from the interviews aligned with your understandings of site-based decision making?

• What surprised you about the information that was shared?

Type your response in the space below.

In order to gain a more thorough understanding of the Site-Based Decision-Making (SBDM) process, I interviewed Cheryl Barron, the La Vernia High School Principal, and Cheryl Young, LVHS Librarian and SBDM committee member.

As an SBDM committee member, Ms. Young told me that “At site base we usually do not see a lot of disagreement as you would see in some of the faculty trainings or meetings. In those scenarios [where we do see disagreement] we have used a variety of techniques to reach consensus or an agreement on how to proceed.” I found this comment interesting as it shows that there is clearly a different tone and a different set of expectations in the SBDM meetings that everyone adheres to. Regarding the committee’s makeup, Ms Young told me that it consists of two parents of students currently enrolled and selected by the principal, two community members that represent the community’s diversity, one business representative that represents the community’s diversity, two thirds of the committee are classroom teachers who are elected by their peers, and that the remaining professional employee members are nonteaching and district level staff. They do not have students serving on the committee. Formal agendas are used during the meetings, and meeting minutes are issued after the meetings. The topics discussed all pertain to Campus Improvement Plan information.

As the Principal, Cheryl Barron explained regarding the group’s dynamics that an overview is provided to the committee of the information to be presented. The committee will divide into groups as needed to discuss topics; the committee will then regroup and present thoughts on the topics, and will comment as needed on the small group findings. Finally, the committee will decide whether to move forward with the small group findings, and the findings are finalized in a plan or report. As to specific decision-making strategies, Ms. Barron said that she uses query-based strategies, such as “What is the issue at hand; what is the goal we would like to reach; how do we attain the goal?” in combination with large or small group discussions and analyses. A number of Southern Regional Education Board [SREB] conflict-resolution strategies are employed if needed. The committee is able to use the query and discussion strategies alone to make most of the decisions.

The information obtained through my interviews aligned with much of my understanding of SBDM committees based on my own participation on district-level improvement committees. I was pleasantly surprised, however, to hear that there is less need for formal conflict-resolution strategies such as the SREB resolution scenarios. It is evident that primarily through discussion

and guided questions alone the committee is able to reach a decision on the problems presented, which demonstrates a respect for the process and shows that all committee members understand they are a part of a team entrusted with the critical task of improving student achievement.

Reflection Two: Next Steps

Remember, this is a journal entry. However, as with any scholarly writing, you should use:

- citations from the research when applicable.
- professional writing protocols.
- professional language.

• **Think about your action plan from the Application assignment. What have you learned in this course about the continuous campus improvement cycle that will dictate your next steps?**

• **What will be your next steps in the continuous improvement process? How will you carry the action plan forward and maintain momentum? Outline and reflect on your next steps in this process.**

Type your response in the space below.

One of the best lessons derived from the Leadership for Accountability class is that the campus improvement cycle must be *continuous*, and that the cycle must start anew each year when the AEIS data is obtained. Too often campuses I have seen have a tendency to put a lot of work into a grand plan, set the plan into motion, and then let it run for a few years expecting to see results. It is clear that every plan must be *constantly re-evaluated* based upon the latest data and fine-tuned to encompass new trends and changes in AEIS standards; this is the only way to avoid the stuckness that typically occurs when you implement a long-range plan and then just sit back and wait for improvement. Therefore, the next step in the continuous improvement cycle is to disaggregate the next round of AEIS data, analyze trends, determine the efficacy of the strategies, and then adjust, add or delete strategies as needed in order to make ongoing progress towards meeting the objectives and overall goals of the campus improvement plan.

If the AEIS data a year from now showed that the action plan I created for LVHS had been effective in getting at least 90% of all Economically Disadvantaged students at La Vernia High School to meet standard in Mathematics on the 2010-11 TAKS administration, I would critically evaluate *all* the disaggregated report data. If trends indicated that the existing plan strategies were proving effective overall, the next growth step would be to implement strategies focusing effort on increasing the performance in mathematics for the Hispanic and LEP students, and then for the Special Education students, in order to bring *all* students up to the exemplary performance level.

E-portfolio assignments:

At the end of this course, you should have completed the following Course-Embedded Internship Logs:

- I-001 Vision and Campus Culture” Course-Embedded Internship Log 2
- II-004 Curriculum, Measurement, and Alignment of Resources” Course-Embedded Internship Log 1
- II-007 Decision Making and Problem Solving” Course-Embedded Internship Log 2
- III-008 Budgeting, Resources Allocation, and Financial Management” Course-Embedded Internship Log 2

- I-003 Integrity and Ethics“ Course-Embedded Internship Log 1

Continue to complete and post Campus-supervised internship reflection logs in the e-portfolio.
All course-embedded and campus-supervised logs must be completed by your 11th course in the program prior to the EDLD 5398 Internship course.